UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691,715	10/22/2003	Scott Davis	004770.00862	6858

22907 7590 09/21/2007

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1100 13th STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051

EXAMINER	
KEATON, SHERROD L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/21/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/691,715	DAVIS, SCOTT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	sherrod keaton	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 July 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *10-33* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *10-33* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *10/22/03* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the filing of July 13, 2007 Claims 1-9 have been cancelled and claims 10-33 are pending and have been considered below:

Withdrawn Rejections

The 1126th rejection of claim 31 has been withdrawn in view of the persuasive argument.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 10-18, 20-25, 27, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukui et al. (US 6940532 A1) and Arbab et al. (US 6778192 B2) as applied to claim 16 and in further view of Ishikawa(5506951).

Claim 16: Fukui discloses a user interface that graphically tracks a user-identified item of interest comprising:

a viewing region that provides the user a window to observe at least a portion of information from a set of information (Column 8, Lines 21-29);

a scroll bar that maps to the set of information (Column 4, Lines 23-30), (Fig 4-7);

a slider associated with the scroll bar that is moved relative to the scroll bar to determine at least a portion of information that is displayed within the viewing region (Column 4, Lines 23-30), (Fig 4-7);

wherein the system is configured for a user to change the location of the item of interest by moving the graphical indicator (Column 8, Lines 16-20). Once a new focus area is found the old focus is deleted moving the new focus to the indicated area.

Fukui does not explicitly disclose,

a location component that obtains a location of the user-identified item of interest, generates a graphical indicator for the item of interest and maps the graphical indicator to the scroll bar to provide the user with a visible indication of the location of the item of interest within the info. However Arbab discloses a system and method for creating

markers on scroll bars of a graphical user interface (Column 2, Lines 35-42). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add indicators to the scroll bar of Fukui. One would have been motivated to do add the indicators as an assistant to the markers. This provides dual identification, which is user-friendlier and can improve accuracy.

Nor does Fukui explicitly disclose wherein the system is configured for a user to change the location of the item of interest by moving the graphical indicator. However Ishikawa discloses a scroll bar with jump tags and further discloses dragging jump tag to a new position on the scroll bar (Fig 6a; Column 9, Lines 8-17). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow indicators to be moved in the modified Fukui as taught by Ishikawa. One would have been motivated to move indicators to a new position to provide flexibility to the system in allowing user to edit positions of interest.

Claim 10: Fukui, Arbab and Ishikawa disclose a user interface that graphically tracks a user-identified item of interest as in Claim 16 and Fukui further discloses wherein the scroll bar is oriented orthogonal, parallel, acute, obtuse angle with respect to an axis of the viewing region (Column 4, Lines 24-30), (Fig. 4-7).

Claim 11: Fukui, Arbab and Ishikawa disclose a user interface that graphically tracks a user-identified item of interest as in Claim 16 and Fukui further discloses that wherein

the user identifies the item of interest by highlighting the item via a mouse, keystroke, or audio stimulus (Column 4, Lines 31-59), (Column 6, Lines 11-51).

Claim 12: Fukui, Arbab and Ishikawa disclose a user interface that graphically tracks a user-identified item of interest as in Claim 16. Arbab further discloses a system and method for creating markers on scroll bars of a graphical user interface (Column 2, Lines 35-42). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the mark of the Fukui and markers of on the scroll of Arbab, and by removing the mark the from the point of interest it would remove the marks on the scroll in the modified Fukui as taught by Arbab. One would have been motivated to allow the markers on the scroll to be removed when item of interest is deleted to increase user friendliness and relieve clutter.

Claim 13: Fukui, Arbab and Ishikawa disclose a user interface that graphically tracks a user-identified item of interest as in Claim 16 above. Arbab further discloses a system and method for creating markers on scroll bars of a graphical user interface and further discloses allowing user to move down the scroll bar to stub points which activates the specific stub point (Column 4, Lines 45-67), (Column 5, Lines 61-67). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to allow the user to move slider to graphical indicator and invoke in the modified Fukui as taught by Arbab. One would have been motivated to allow user to move slider to the graphical

indicator increase user friendliness, because in the case that there are multiple indicators user can slide to a specific point.

Claim 14: Fukui, Arbab and Ishikawa disclose that the user returns to item of interest via one of moving the slider proximate to the graphical indicator and invoking the graphical indicator as in Claim 16 above and Fukui further discloses that the graphical indicator is invoked via mouse, keystroke, or audio stimulus (Column 4, Lines 31-59), (Column 6, Lines 11-51).

Claim 15: Fukui, Arbab and Ishikawa disclose that the user returns to item of interest via one of moving the slider proximate to the graphical indicator and invoking the graphical indicator as in Claim 13 above and Fukui further discloses graphical indicator automatically returns the item of interest within the viewing region (Column 5, Lines 28-43).

Claim 17: Fukui, Arbab and Ishikawa disclose a user interface that graphically tracks a user-identified item of interest as in Claim 16 above and Arbab discloses a system and method for creating markers on scroll bars of a graphical user interface and allows user to identify multiple stub points (Column 2, Lines 35-42), (Column 4, Lines 9-23). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to associate graphical indicators with one or more additional items of interest in the modified Fukui as taught by Arbab. One would have been motivated to

associate graphical indicators with one or more items of interest to allow the user to have more flexibility with the system, because many times there will be more than one point of interest.

Claim 18: Fukui, Arbab and Ishikawa disclose a user interface that graphically tracks a user-identified item of interest as in Claim 16 above and Fukui further discloses wherein the graphical indicator is visible within the slider when the item of interest is visible within the viewing window (Column 3, Lines 55-69), (Column 4, Lines 1-9).

Claim 20: Fukui, Arbab and Ishikawa disclose a user interface that graphically tracks a user-identified item of interest as in Claim 16 above and Arbab further discloses a system and method for creating markers on scroll bars of a graphical user interface (Column 2, Lines 35-42), and Fukui discloses a vertical and horizontal scroll bar (Figure 3-7). Therefore it would have been obvious to put stub points on the vertical and horizontal scroll bar to have multi-dimensional tracking. One would have been motivated to add the stub points to the horizontal scroll bar if there is extensive information that needs to be horizontally displayed.

Claim 21: Fukui, Arbab and Ishikawa disclose a user interface that graphically tracks a user-identified item of interest as in Claim 16 above and Arbab further discloses a system and method for creating markers on scroll bars of a graphical user interface and

further discloses an intelligence component that can designate points of interest and their importance (Column 4, Lines 23-39). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add an intelligence component to the modified Fukui as taught by Arbab. One would have been motivated to add the intelligence item to increase efficiency to the program, and flag items considered important to the program.

Claim 22: Fukui, Arbab and Ishikawa disclose wherein an intelligence component that facilities adding and removing the graphical indicator and returning the item of interest to the viewing region as in Claim 21 above and Arbab further discloses a system and method for creating markers on scroll bars of a graphical user interface and further discloses the intelligence comprising statistic, probability, an inference or classifier (Column 4, Lines 23-39). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the intelligence to the modified Fukui as taught by Arbab. One would have been motivated to have these intelligence programs to check items that have a tendency to change.

Claim 23: Fukui discloses a method comprising:

a.) receiving an input associated with the user-identified point of focus within a list (Column 4, Lines 9-22);

b.) obtaining a location of the user-identified point of focus within the list (Column 4, Lines 9-22);

c.) adding a first graphical indicator to the scroll bar, the first graphical indicator provides a relative location of the user-identified point of focus within the list (Column 4, Lines 9-22).

However Fukui does not explicitly disclose adding the indicia to the scroll bar. Arbab discloses a system and method for creating markers on scroll bars of a graphical user interface (Column 2, Lines 35-42).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add graphical indicia related to a point of focus to the scroll bar of Fukui. One would have been motivated to have the point of focus added to the scroll bar to because scrolling through many rows of information can be difficult and the point can be missed and stub points with different levels of importance may be overlooked.

Nor does Fukui explicitly disclose changing the location of the point of focus based on user input moving the graphical indicator on the scroll bar. However Ishikawa discloses a scroll bar with jump tags and further discloses dragging jump tag to a new position (Fig 6a; Column 9, Lines 8-17). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow indicators to be moved in the modified Fukui as taught by Ishikawa. One would have been motivated to move indicators to a new position to provide flexibility to the system in allowing user to edit positions of interest.

Claim 24: Fukui, Arbab and Ishikawa disclose a method that adds graphical indicia related to a point of focus to scroll bar as in Claim 23 above and Arbab further discloses

a system and method for creating markers on scroll bars of a graphical user interface and further discloses multiple stub marks for specific locations (Column 4, Lines 9-22). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add multiple graphical indicia related to a point of focus to the scroll bar of the modified Fukui as taught by Arbab. One would have been motivated add multiple points to eliminate confusion of single or multiple points of interest.

Fukui and Arbab do not explicitly disclose

Changing the location of the second point of focus based on user input moving the second graphical indicator on the scroll bar. However Ishikawa discloses a scroll bar with jump tags and further discloses dragging jump tags to a new position (Fig 6a; Column 6, Lines 21-24; Column 9, Lines 8-17). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow the second indicator to also be moved in the modified Fukui as taught by Ishikawa. One would have been motivated to move multiple indicators to a new position to provide flexibility to the system by allowing user to edit positions of interest.

Claim 25: Fukui, Arbab and Ishikawa disclose adding a second graphical indicator to the scroll bar, the second graphical indicator is associated with the second user identified point of focus within the list as in Claim 23 above and Arbab further discloses a system and method for creating markers on scroll bars of a graphical user interface and further discloses allowing user to use multiple stub points in different positions

(Column 4, Lines 9-22), (Fig. 3). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow the indicator to be differentiated by position on the scroll bar of Fukui. One would have been motivated to differentiate the position to distinguish a level of importance between the points interest.

Claim 27: Fukui discloses a method that returns a point of focus to a user comprising:

obtaining a position of the point of focus from the graphical indicator (Column 4, Lines 40-50), (Column 6, Lines 23-60);

utilizing the position to locate the point of focus within data (Column 4, Lines 40-50), (Column 6, Lines 23-60).

Fukui discloses selecting a graphical indicator, said graphical indicator associated with the point of focus (Column 4, Lines 40-50), (Column 6, Lines 23-60) but does not explicitly disclose on the scroll bar. However Arbab discloses a system and method for creating markers on scroll bars of a graphical user interface (Column 2, Lines 35-42). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the graphical indicator on the scroll bar. One would have been motivated to do add the indicators as an assistant to the markers. This provides dual identification, which is user-friendlier and can improve accuracy.

Nor does Fukui explicitly disclose changing the location of the point of focus based on user input moving the graphical indicator on the scroll bar. However Ishikawa discloses a scroll bar with jump tags and further discloses dragging jump tag to a new position (Fig 6a; Column 9, Lines 8-17). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow indicators to be moved in the modified Fukui as taught by Ishikawa. One would have been motivated to move indicators to a new position to provide flexibility to the system in allowing user to edit positions of interest.

Claim 29: Fukui, Arbab and Ishikawa disclose a method that returns a point of focus to a user as in Claim 27 above and further discloses invoking the graphical indicator to automatically return to point of focus to the user (Column 5, Lines 28-43).

Claim 30: Fukui, Arbab and Ishikawa disclose a method that returns a point of focus to a user as in Claim 27 above and disclose manually navigating a slider proximate to the graphical indicator to return the point of focus to the user. Arbab discloses a system and method for creating markers on scroll bars of a graphical user interface and further discloses allowing user to navigate the slider to points of interest (Column 3, Lines 55-63), (Fig. 3). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow user the ability to manually navigate slider to points of interest in the modified Fukui as taught by Arbab. One would have been motivated to

give the user the ability to control the slider manually in addition to automatic navigation to provide dual control in direction and access of points of interest in close proximity.

Claim 31: Fukui discloses a system that graphically tracks user-identified foci comprising:

a.) means for identifying foci (Column 4, lines 30-59);

b.) means for generating graphical indicia associated with the foci (Column 4, Lines 30-59);

Fukui does not explicitly disclose

c.) means for associating the graphical indicia with a positioning mechanism; and

d.) means for employing the positioning mechanism in connection with the graphical indicia to view the foci.

However Arbab discloses a system and method for creating markers on scroll bars of a graphical user interface (Column 3, Lines 55-63). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to associate the indicator with the positioning mechanism and employ the connection with the view of Fukui. One would have been motivated to do so to give user a more accurate and efficient program for viewing and editing.

Fukui does not explicitly disclose

Means for moving the graphical indicia based on the user input to change the location of the associated foci. However Ishikawa discloses a scroll bar with jump tags and further discloses dragging jump tag to a new position (Fig 6a; Column 9, Lines 8-17). Therefore

it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow indicators to be moved in the modified Fukui as taught by Ishikawa. One would have been motivated to move indicators to a new position to provide flexibility to the system by allowing user to edit positions of interest.

3. Claim 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukui et al. (US 6940532 A1), Arbab et al. (US 6778192 B2), Ishikawa(5506951) as applied to claim 16 and in further view of Martinez et al (6147683)

Claim 32: Fukui, Arbab and Ishikawa disclose the system as in Claim 20 above but do not explicitly disclose associating as additional graphical indicator corresponding to one of the additional one or more scroll bars with the graphical indicator corresponding to the item of interest. However Martinez discloses a graphical selection marker and method for list that are larger than a display window and further discloses placing indicators on the multiple scroll bars regarding a point of interest (Column 8, Lines 23-38). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include indicators on the multiple scroll bars of the modified Fukui as taught by Martinez. One would have been motivated to place multiple indicators on the scroll bars to provide improved accuracy on points of interest to the user.

Claim 33: Fukui, Arbab, Ishikawa and Martinez disclose a system as in claim 32 above and further disclose wherein the graphical user interface, upon receiving user input selecting any graphical indicator corresponding to the item of interest, automatically moves all sliders proximately to a location on each corresponding scroll bar of the graphical indicator corresponding to the item of interest. Fukui discloses automatically moving back to the point of interest (Column 5, Lines 40-62). Martinez discloses placing indicators on the multiple scroll bars regarding a point of interest (Column 8, Lines 23-38).

4. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukui et al. (US 6940532 A1), Arbab et al. (US 6778192 B2), Ishikawa(5506951) as applied to claim 16 and in further view of Eisenberg (US 6331866 B1).

Claim 19: Fukui, Arbab and Ishikawa disclose a user interface that graphically tracks a user-identified item of interest as in Claim 16 above but do not explicitly disclose the graphical indicator dynamically changes in size in response to a change in size in the set of information in order to maintain relative indication of the percentage of information. However Eisenberg discloses a display control for software notes and further discloses indicator being sized based on selected portion of information (Column 2, Lines 53-67), (Column 4, Lines 1-5). Therefore it would have been obvious to one

having ordinary skill in the art the time of the invention to have an indicator in which size is adjusted based on information in the modified Fukui as taught by Eisenberg. One would have been motivated to have indicator size adjustment based on information to improve user navigation proficiency by distinguishing between points of slight interest and large points of focus on items that may need to be edited.

5. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukui et al. (US 6940532 A1), Arbab et al. (US 6778192 B2), Ishikawa(5506951) as applied to claim 23 and in further view of MacPhail (US 6924797 B1).

Claim 26: Fukui, Arbab and Ishikawa disclose a method that adds graphical indicia related to a point of focus to scroll bar as in Claim 23 above but do not explicitly disclose positioning a pointer proximate to the graphical indicia to obtain information indicative of the point of focus. However MacPhail discloses an arrangement of information into linear form for display on diverse display devices and further discloses placing pointer over selectable points to obtain information (Column 9, Lines 15-26). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the information display of MacPhail to the scroll bar of the modified Fukui as One would have been motivated to do have the information display for rapid selection.

6. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukui et al. (US 6940532 A1), Arbab et al. (US 6778192 B2), Ishikawa(5506951) as applied to claim 27 and in further view of MacPhail (US 6924797 B1).

Claim 28: Fukui, Arbab and Ishikawa disclose a method that returns a point of focus to a user as in Claim 27 above but does not explicitly disclose positioning a pointer over the graphical indicator to obtain information indicative of the point of focus in order to facilitate selecting the desired graphical indicator from a plurality of graphical indicators. However MacPhail discloses an arrangement of information into linear form for display on diverse display devices and further discloses gathering information from selectable points (Column 8, Lines 17-50). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the information display for multiple points of MacPhail into the modified Fukui. One would have been motivated to do display information of multiple points to have clarity if multiple points that are in the same area.

Response to Arguments

Claims 16, 23 and 31: Applicant's arguments with have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as necessitated by applicants' amendment of the claims. Examiner notes that Fukui allows a new mark to be set in essence moving

the point of interest by moving the mark (Column 8, Lines 17-20). Also, examiner notes that the claim language that recites mapping a graphical indicator to a scroll bar is open to a different interpretation than a graphical indicator being placed on a scroll bar.

Claim 19: Applicant's arguments with have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as necessitated by applicants' amendment of the claim 16.

Claim 26: Applicant's arguments with have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as necessitated by applicants' amendment of the claim 23.

Claim 27: Applicant's arguments with have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as necessitated by applicants' amendment of the claims.

Claim 28: Applicant's arguments with have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as necessitated by applicants' amendment of the claim 27.

Conclusion

Applicants amendments necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sherrod Keaton whose telephone number is 571) 270-1697. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. and alternating Fri. off (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, KRISTINE KINCAID can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SLK

9-05-07

Kristine Kincaid

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100